

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8

9 LEWIS ANDERSON,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 XAVIER BECERRA, *et al.*,

13 Defendants.
14
15

Case No. 1:20-cv-00068-DAD-SAB (PC)

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S SECOND
MOTION TO CORRECT ERROR IN FILING
APPLICATION TO PROCEED *IN FORMA*
PAUPERIS AND DISREGARDING
PLAINTIFF'S FOURTH APPLICATION TO
PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS* AS
UNSIGNED AND UNNECESSARY

(ECF No. 14)

16 Plaintiff Lewis Anderson is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* in this civil rights action
17 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

18 On January 14, 2020, Plaintiff initiated this action by filing a complaint and an application
19 to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (ECF Nos. 1, 2.) On January 17, 2020, the undersigned issued
20 findings and recommendations, recommending that Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma*
21 *pauperis* be denied pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), and that Plaintiff be ordered to pay the
22 \$400.00 filing fee in full in order to proceed with this action. (ECF No. 4.) The findings and
23 recommendations were served on Plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were
24 to be filed within thirty (30) days after service. (*Id.* at 4.) On February 3, 2020, Plaintiff filed
25 written objections to the findings and recommendations. (ECF No. 8.) As of this date, Plaintiff's
26 application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, (ECF No. 2), and the undersigned's January 17, 2020
27 findings and recommendations remain pending before the assigned District Judge.

28 On February 3, 2020, Plaintiff filed a second application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

1 (ECF No. 9.) On February 6, 2019, the Court disregarded Plaintiff's second application to
2 proceed *in forma pauperis* as unnecessary because Plaintiff's first application to proceed *in forma*
3 *pauperis* was still pending before the assigned District Judge. (ECF No. 10.)

4 On February 7, 2020, Plaintiff filed a motion to correct error in filing the application to
5 proceed *in forma pauperis* and a third application to proceed *in forms pauperis*. (ECF Nos. 12,
6 13.) On February 11, 2020, the Court denied as moot Plaintiff's motion to correct error in filing
7 the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and denied Plaintiff's third application to proceed *in*
8 *forma pauperis* as unnecessary. (ECF No. 15.)

9 Currently before the Court is Plaintiff's second motion to correct error in filing the
10 application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and Plaintiff's fourth application to proceed *in forma*
11 *pauperis*, filed on February 10, 2020 and docketed by the Court on February 11, 2020. (ECF No.
12 14.) In his motion, Plaintiff states that he is submitting a new application to proceed *in forma*
13 *pauperis* because, when he filed his application to proceed *in forma pauperis* on February 3,
14 2020, he forgot to provide the Court with his prison trust account statement showing the activity
15 in his trust account for the six months prior to filing the complaint. (ECF No. 14.)

16 However, since the Court has already disregarded Plaintiff's February 3, 2020 second
17 application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, Plaintiff's second motion to correct error in filing the
18 application to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied as moot.

19 Further, a review of Plaintiff's fourth application to proceed *in forma pauperis* reveals that
20 Plaintiff did not sign the application. All filings submitted to the Court must bear the signature of
21 the filing party. Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(a); Local Rule 131. Additionally, since Plaintiff's first
22 application to proceed *in forma pauperis* is still pending before the assigned District Judge,
23 Plaintiff's fourth application is unnecessary. Therefore, Plaintiff's fourth application to proceed
24 *in forma pauperis* is disregarded as unsigned and unnecessary.

25 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 26 1. Plaintiff's second motion to correct error in filing the application to proceed *in*
27 *forma pauperis*, (ECF No. 14), is DENIED as moot; and

28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

2. Plaintiff's fourth application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, (ECF No. 14), is
DISREGARDED as unsigned and unnecessary.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 13, 2020


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE